

Special Emphasis Panel in Systemic Reform; Meeting

In accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92-463, as amended), the National Science Foundation announces the following meeting:

Name: Special Emphasis Panel in Systemic Reform.

Dates: February 16-17, 1995.

Times: 12:00 noon-6:30 p.m.; February 16, 1995;

8:00 a.m.-12:00 noon; February 17, 1995.

Place: Doubletree Hotel, 300 Army Navy Drive, Arlington, Virginia 22202, (703) 416-4100, FAX (703) 416-4126.

Type of Meeting: Closed.

Contact: Dr. Richard J. Anderson, Senior Project Director, Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research, Office of Systemic Reform, National Science Foundation, Suite 875, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230, (703) 306-1683.

Purpose of Meeting: To provide advice and recommendations concerning proposals submitted to the NSF EPSCoR program for financial support.

Agenda: To review and evaluate proposals from states participating in the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research. Proposals requesting one-year Experimental Systemic Initiative grants are submitted in response to NSF EPSCoR solicitation 94-55.

Reason for Closing: The proposals being reviewed include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information; financial data, such as salaries; and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals. These matters are exempt under 5 U.S.C. 522 b. (c) (4) and (6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act.

Dated: January 30, 1995.

M. Rebecca Winkler,

Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 95-2604 Filed 2-1-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Documents Containing Reporting or Recordkeeping Requirements: Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Review

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of the OMB review of information collection.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has recently submitted to OMB for review the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

1. Type of submission, new, or extension: New.

2. The title of the information collection: Policy Statements, "Criteria

for Guidance of States and NRC in Discontinuance of NRC Regulatory Authority and Assumption Thereof By States Through Agreement" (46 FR 7540; January 23, 1981, as amended by policy statements published at 46 FR 36969, July 16, 1981, and 48 FR 33376, July 21, 1983) and "NRC Review of Agreement State Radiation Control Programs: Final General Statement of Policy" (57 FR 22495, May 28, 1992); and Comprehensive and Update questionnaires, Evaluation of Agreement State Radiation Control Programs.

3. The form number if applicable: Not applicable.

4. How often the collection is required: Policy Statements: As needed. Questionnaires: Initially for review of a State's request to become an Agreement State Program and biennial thereafter.

5. Who will be required or asked to report: Any State receiving Agreement State status by signing Section 274(b) agreement with NRC. Presently there are 29 Agreement States. Because a few of the States have more than one program, there are 34 programs in all.

6. An estimate of the number of responses: New Agreement States: Approximately one response every three years; Existing Agreement States: Approximately one-half (17) of continuing Agreement State programs are asked to respond annually.

7. An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request: For continuing Agreement State programs, approximately 211,680 hours would be expended, or an average of 6,226 hours per program; for a new Agreement State program, approximately 3,600 hours would be expended each year over a three year period; therefore, approximately a total of 215,280 hours would be expended annually.

8. An indication of whether Section 3504(h) Pub. L. 96-511 applies: Not applicable.

9. Abstract: Agreement States are requested to provide information concerning their materials regulatory programs in their States. This information is used by the Commission to carry out its reviews of State radiation control programs to ensure that these programs are compatible with the Commission's, meet the applicable parts of Section 274 of the Atomic Energy Act, and are adequate to protect the public health and safety.

Copies of the submittal may be inspected or obtained for a fee from the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW (Lower Level), Washington, D.C. 20037.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB Reviewer:

Troy Hillier, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150-NEOB-10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503).

Comments may also be communicated by telephone at (202) 395-3084.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda J. Shelton, (301) 415-7233.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 28th day of January, 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Gerald S. Cranford,

Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management.

[FR Doc. 95-2576 Filed 2-1-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 50-325]

Carolina Power & Light Company; Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Unit 1 Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an one/time Exemption from the requirements of Section III.D.1.(a) of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 for Facility Operating License No. DPR-71 issued to the Carolina Power & Light Company (the licensee) for operation of the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Unit 1 (BSEP-1), located in Brunswick County, North Carolina.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would grant a one-time partial Exemption from the schedular requirement in Section III.D.1.(a) of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50, which requires a set of 3 Type A containment integrated leak rate tests to be performed at approximately equal intervals during each 10-year service period. The third test of the set shall be conducted when the plant is shutdown for the 10-year plant inservice inspections. The proposed action would extend the second 10-year period for the performance of the third Type A test at BSEP-1 until the reload 10 outage (B110R1) in September 1996.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for Exemption dated November 22, 1994.

The Need for the Proposed Action

During the first 10-year service period, Type A tests were conducted as required by 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J. Since the first 10-year service period for BSEP-1 was not aligned with the service period for BSEP-2, the licensee moved the end date for the BSEP-1 back to coincide with the BEEP-2 end date.

Therefore, the second 10-year service period for BEEP-1 began on July 10, 1986. This caused the first BEEP-1 Type A test for the second period to be performed in May 1987, only 11 months into the interval. The second Type A test on BEEP-1 was performed within the 40-month plus or minus 10-month interval required by the Technical Specifications.

However, BEEP-1, experienced an extended shutdown between April 1992 and February 1994. The licensee notified the NRC in a letter dated August 5, 1994, that the second 10-year service period end date was being extended by one year due to this outage. Because of this shutdown, the licensee also rescheduled the remaining two BEEP-1 refueling outages (reloads 9 and 10) during the second 10-year service period. The reload 9 outage was rescheduled to begin in April 1995, and the reload 10 outage was rescheduled to begin in September 1996.

Unlike Section XI, IWA-2400(c) of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (ASME Code), Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 does not contain any provisions for adjusting the 10-year service period due to extended outages. The licensee has already performed two of the Type A tests at BEEP-1 required during the second 10-year service period. If a Type A test is conducted during the next refueling outage, Appendix J could be interpreted to require a fourth test to satisfy the requirement that the final test of the set be conducted when the plant is shutdown for the 10-year plant inservice inspection. Due to the extension of the inservice inspection period, the final refueling outage of the current inservice inspection period is scheduled for September 1996.

Granting of the proposed Exemption would result in an interval of approximately 68 months between the second and third Type A tests. The proposed Exemption would allow the start of the next Type A test interval to be realigned with the start of the third 10-year inservice inspection period. The Exemption would also minimize the radiation exposure to the personnel conducting the test through the elimination of a fourth test.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that granting the proposed Exemption would not significantly increase the probability or amount of expected containment leakage and that containment integrity would be

maintained. The licensee has reviewed the potential primary containment degradation mechanisms, including both activity-based and time-based causes. This review concluded that there has not been any alteration or challenge to the primary containment since the last Type A test. The licensee also stated that there will not be any future maintenance activity during the proposed interval extension that would adversely affect the primary containment leakage rate without administrative control requiring the performance of local leak rate testing. There are also no scheduled modifications that have the potential to adversely affect the integrity of the primary containment boundary.

The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to the action would be to deny the request. Such action would not enhance the protection of the environment and would result in unjustified cost to the licensee and additional exposure to plant personnel.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Brunswick Stream Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, dated January 1974.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, the NRC staff consulted with the State of North Carolina official regarding the

environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated November 22, 1994, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555 and at the Local Public Document Room located at the University of North Carolina at Wilmington, William Madison Randall Library, 601 S. College Road, Wilmington, North Carolina 28403-3297.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of January 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William H. Bateman,

Director, Project Directorate II-1, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-2573 Filed 2-1-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 50-313]

Entergy Operations, Inc.; Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 1 Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from Facility Operating License No. DPR-51, issued to Entergy Operations, Inc., (the licensee), for operation of the Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit No. 1 (ANO-1), located in Pope County, Arkansas.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

Section III.D.1(a) of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 addresses requirements for periodic containment building integrated leakage rate tests (ILRTs). The tests measure the ability of the containment building to isolate the containment building atmosphere from the environment. The containment building is designed to prevent radioactive releases to the environment from the reactor and radioactive systems located inside the containment.